

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 17 is amended to address the objection, discussed below.

Claims 30-32 are cancelled without prejudice to the subject matter therein. The claims are cancelled in order to reduce the issues in the current application.

It is believed there is no possibility of new matter.

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are in the case.

Applicant's first want to thank the Examiner for the courteous and helpful discussion of 26 February 2008, with Applicant's representative. During the meeting, Applicant's representative expressed appreciation for the indication of allowable subject matter. In addition, certain language in Claim 1 ("barg"), and Claim 17 (the spurious "t" and the Markush Group), and the rejection of the apparatus claims (Claims 30-32) were discussed. The following remarks are intended to address the issues outstanding.

With respect to the use of the term "barg", the term is well-known "shorthand" for "bar-gauge", no different in kind from terms such as "wt%" and the like. A quick search of the patent literature finds it is used in claims often; e.g., see U.S. 5,196,049. A description is found, for instance, in Wikipedia, which is reproduced in part below:

In some countries, pressure is measured with reference to atmospheric pressure. This is *gauge* pressure and denoted by barg, often written with no spaces, spoken "bar gauge", and sometimes using symbols such as 'bar(g)'. For example, if someone says that their car tyres are pressurised to 2.3 bar they actually mean bar gauge: the pressure in the tyre is really 3.3 bar, but only 2.3 bar above atmospheric, which is the scale a tyre gauge would read. When absolute pressure is desired, it is sometimes denoted 'bara' or 'bar(a)' for "bar absolute". The alteration of units of measure for this purpose is now deprecated, with qualification of the physical property being preferred, e.g., "The gauge pressure is 2.3 bar; the absolute pressure is 3.3 bar".

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully urge that no new objection or rejection should be made with respect to this usage.

Applicant's have amended Claim 17 in order to clearly delete the spurious "t", which was clearly simply a typographical error, and also to use proper Markush Claim formatting.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request that the objection to Claim 17 be withdrawn.

Finally, with respect to the apparatus claims, Applicant's have cancelled these claims, without prejudice as to the subject matter therein.

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request that the rejection under §103 be withdrawn.

There being no further issues, it is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 22, 2008
Date

/Andrew B. Griffiths/
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,336

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-1886
Fax: 281-834-2495